



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,183	12/04/2003	Marshall Miles	P/144-327	2389
7590 03/20/2009 OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFTEN, LLP 1180 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036-8403				
EXAMINER				
VU, BAO Q				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2838				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/20/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/729,183
Filing Date: December 04, 2003
Appellant(s): MILES, MARSHALL

James A Finder
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed November 26, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed February 8, 2008.

(I) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(II) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(III) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(IV) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(V) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(VI) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(VII) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(VII) Evidence Relied Upon

(9) Grounds of Rejection


The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:


1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) as being clearly anticipated by Youn et al. (USP 6,459,604). See figures 2 and 3 (below). See also the abstract.





(10) Response to Argument

Claims 1-9

Applicant's claim 1 copied below with the prior art (Youn et al.) equivalent in parenthesis (See above figures):

(Original) A power adapter comprising:

a first housing (100) :

a second housing (200) remote from the first housing (100);

an AC input receptacle (arrow into 101) provided in the first housing (100);

a voltage converting circuit (rectifier 102) enclosed within the first housing (100) and electrically connected to the AC input receptacle (arrow into 101), the voltage converting circuit (rectifier 102) converting input AC power into a DC voltage; and a voltage regulating circuit (drive voltage output unit 202) electrically connectable to the voltage converting circuit (rectifier 102) and enclosed within the second housing (200), the voltage regulating circuit (drive voltage output unit 202) maintaining and outputting the DC voltage from the voltage converting circuit.

As can be seen above the Youn reference discloses the claimed invention. The claim language is not distinct from that of the prior art. Appellant argues that "only a few components

contained in the front end stage of a typical ac-dc enclosed in the first housing. The second housing encloses the voltage regulating circuit which converts the high dc voltage generated by the first housing to a desired low output voltage.” This does not distinguish the claimed invention from that of the prior art. The first housing of Youn contains a rectifier (front end stage of ac-dc) and second housing (200) of Youn clearly discloses a voltage regulating circuit which converts the high voltage DC of the first housing to a lower voltage DC in the second housing with the line filter and the drive voltage output unit.

Appellant argues that “a power adapter which has a relatively simple structure, a high efficiency and improved output performance. Moreover, because the first housing need only contain the voltage converting circuit, the power adapter has increased thermal performance and improved electromagnetic interference characteristics.” Being “relatively simple structure, a high efficiency and improved output performance” are not patentable subject matter.

In response to appellant’s argument that the references fail to show certain features of appellant’s invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., power adapter has increased thermal performance and improved electromagnetic interference characteristics) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Appellant’s argument with respect to “With the present power adapter, the five different input connectors could be produced separately from the five voltage regulating portions. Then the desired input connector style can be matched to desired voltage regulating portion. Thus, only 10 separate items need be manufactured (5 input connector styles + 5 voltage regulating

portions)” Appellant has failed to articulate this feature in any of the claims and it is noted that the prior art reference Youn teaches two housing AC adapter component for the conversion of AC/DC.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Bao Q. Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2838
March 14, 2009*

Conferees:

/Akm Enayet Ullah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2838

/Ricky L. Mack/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2873